



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, May, 1901.

## THE FRENCH CONDITION CONTRARY TO FACT.

In the earliest French monuments, the unreal condition both present and past is expressed by the use of the subjunctive in the protasis and apodosis. Later, the subjunctive disappears entirely in the present unreal condition and, in part, in the past unreal condition. This change of syntax renders necessary a historical examination of the French condition contrary to fact, in order to trace first the gradual disappearance of the subjunctive and, in the second place, to note the constructions by which the subjunctive has been supplanted. In the present paper such a study has been made on the basis of the material collected from an examination of representative French authors,<sup>1</sup> ranging from the eleventh century to the present time. While the list of texts here examined is by no means exhaustive, it may be considered as fairly representative. I have examined few texts later than the sixteenth century for the reason that most of the changes in the construction in question took place before that time.

### I.

#### EXAMPLES OF OCCURRENCE IN THE TEXTS EXAMINED.

##### A. *Present condition contrary to fact.*

a. Imperfect subjunctive in the protasis and apodosis :

E Deus, dist il, bels reis qui tot governes,  
Se tei ploust ici ne volaise estre (A, 41 ab).  
Fust i li Reis n'i oïssum damage (C, l. 1102).  
De la joie assez vos contasse,  
Se ma parole n'i gastasse (J, l. 2393).  
Je oi la fors et grant noise et grant cri;  
S'or eüssions bons destriers arrabis,  
Ja oïssions la fors tot ademis  
Por nos vengier de nos max enemis (O, l. 3795).  
Se j' osasse amer,  
Volentiers amasse (P, II, 65, 11).  
Se carmes et herbes vaussissent,  
Jamés amors ne departissent (T, l. 1321).  
Et ce ie faillir ne cuidasse,

<sup>1</sup> In cases where it seemed to be a sufficient test of an author's usage, I have examined only one volume of his works.

De sa biautei vos devisaisse (V, l. 188).  
Si bataille perdue fust reprouche, on ne  
Luy feïst pas tel honneur (Z, 45).

b. Imperfect subjunctive in the protasis and conditional in the apodosis :

Dist Guillelmes d'Orange : "E, sainz Pieres, aïue !  
Car la tenisse en France, et Bertrans si i fusset,  
A pis et a martels sereit aconseïe !" (B, l. 326).  
Mais bien dist que M mars d'argent  
Au grant pois vorroit avoir mis  
Se cil fust autant sez amis  
Qui sa gent avoit fait la honte,  
Que il estoit amis au conte (Q, l. 5277).  
S'il fuissent andui present,  
Pais fereient a tel parlement (R, p. 5).

c. Imperfect indicative in the protasis and conditional in the apodosis :

E tuz tens durereit,  
Se li soleïlz n' esteit.  
Nuit est tute plenièr  
La u nen at lumiere;  
E tuz tens durereit,  
Se li soleïlz n' esteit (E, l. 316).  
Et se je pooie amander  
La mort don je n'ai rien forsset,  
Je l'amanderoie sans plet (J, l. 1992).  
Or te di bien, mielz amereie  
Tun sul engin, se jeo l'aveie,  
Que cels dunt ai ma puche pleine (K, xcviij, 33).  
Et s'ele estoit ja çî, je l'arderoie  
En un fu (L, 10, 55).  
Se le tenoie as puins, por le chîté de Blaives  
Ne le rendroie mie a mon frere carnable (M, l. 424).  
Et, s'avoye fleurs et marjolaine,  
Par despit je les deschiroye (DD, l. 599).  
Si j' avois du papier  
De rames un millier,  
Et qu'il ne fust trop tard,  
Comme a mon amy seur,  
T'escrirois de bon cuer (EE, p. 404).

##### B. *Past condition contrary to fact.*

a. Imperfect subjunctive (=pluperfect subjunctive) in the protasis and apodosis :

Se jo t'sousse la jus soz le degret,  
Ou as gent de longe enfermetet,  
Ja tote gent ne m'soussent torner  
Qu' emsembl' od tel m'ousse converset (A, 98a).  
Sempres caïst, se Deus ne li aidast (C, l. 3439).  
Petit por mon oste fêisse,  
Se cest don li escondêisse (J, l. 265).  
Car se il te seüst, ja ne t'osast tempter  
Ne t'osast traïr ne faire en crois pener (N, l. 598).  
Quant ge le senti si flairier,  
Ge n'oi talent de repairier;  
Ains m'aprochasse por le prendre,  
Se g'i osasse la main tendre (S, 1679).

b. Imperfect subjunctive (=pluperfect) in the protasis and the pluperfect subjunctive in the apodosis :

Se me leust si t'ousse guardet (A, 98e).  
 Si li Sires ne fust en nus,  
     cum s'esdreowent sur nus humes ;  
 Puet cel estre vis oïssent  
     gluti nus . . . . . (D, 123, 3).  
 S'il an i eïist cinc sestiers,  
 S'eïst ele autel fet, ce cuit (J, 1. 3008).  
 Ja l'eïist mort s'il eïst sa vertu (O, 1. 1191).  
 Se ne fust li fors de haubers,  
 Molt l'eüst de cel cop bléchié (Q, 1. 5379).  
 Se ge l'eusse en ma baillie,  
 Il m'eüst rendue la vie (S, 1. 1738).  
 Se je bien me peüsse aidier,  
 Moult eüsse eu de delit (U, 1. 802).

c. Pluperfect subjunctive in the protasis and imperfect subjunctive (=pluperfect) in the apodosis :

E si tu ne l'ouses fait,  
 Deu apareillast tun règne sur  
 Israel parmanablement (G, 13, 34).  
 Se je a cort trové l'eüsse,  
 Ja requerre ne li seïssie  
 Rien nule qui me fust vee (J, 1. 3703).  
 Se deus eust mis auoc les biens  
 Humilitei, n'i fausist riens (V, 1. 277).

d. Pluperfect subjunctive in the protasis and apodosis :

N'eüssent pas cel mal eïl,  
 S'il eüssent conseil creï (K, xvii, 27).  
 Se l'eust fait . i . autre, ja l'eust comperé (M, 1. 110).  
 Mais s'il n'eïst prié merci el l'eüst mort (W, 1. 3506).  
 Se nous y eussions entré au point

du jour, nous ne fussiens pas venus a nostre dit hauberge (Y, 233).

Brief, se eusse sceu pellerinage  
 Dont remède me fust venu  
 Pour obvier a telle raige,  
 J'y eusse esté avant tout nu (DD, 1. 789).  
 Mais si tu m'en eusses parlé,  
 Ton affaire en fust mieulx allé (EE, p. 7).  
 Si elle m'eust tenu bon, i'eusse  
 Assourdi touts mes amis (FF, i, 9, 44).  
 L'Anc, s'il eût osé, se fût mis en colère (JJ, ii, xix, 23).

e. Pluperfect subjunctive in the protasis and conditional in the apodosis :

Si mort l'eusse, à mort me turnereit (G, ii, 2, 33).  
 Mult par sereie desleials,

trop sereie malvais e fals, se j, encuntre vostre santé lur eüsse le quer embé (K, lxx, 63).

Si ensemele eüssent parlé  
 Tost en seroient acordé (R, p. 5).  
 J'estimerois la recompense ingrate,  
 Si pour vous six eust travaillé sa teste (EE, p. 468).

f. Pluperfect indicative in the protasis and conditional in the apodosis :

S'ele s'en iert alec fors,  
 Ne seroit pas au tel mastire (J, 1. 3538),  
 Et se je l'avoie estei  
 Pour Diu, le roi de maestei,  
 Por votre amor le guerpiroie (Q, 1. 1189).  
 Sy vous avoye meffait  
 A vous, ma doucle amye,  
 D'une espee en effect  
 Je m'ousteroye la vie (CC, p. 101).  
 Si tu n'avois servi qu'un meunier, comme moi,  
     Tu ne serois pas si malade (JJ, i, iv, 18).  
 Oui, je, mourrais content du marché qui me tue,  
 Si je t'avais trouvée au lieu de ta statue (NN, i, vi, 83).

g. Pluperfect indicative in the protasis and conditional perfect in the apodosis :

Trai avreie mun seignur,  
 Ki m'a nurri desq' a cest jor ;  
 Malement avreit enpleié  
 Qu'il m'a nurri e afaïté,  
 Se par ma garde aveit perdu  
 Ceo dunt il m'a lung tens peï (K, xx, 19).  
 S'or aviez felonie enpensé,  
 En petit d'ore m'avriez ja tué (O, 1. 2323).  
 Je n'ai de vostre amor cure,  
 Car je seux toute seure  
 Et bien fie  
 Ke se vos m'avies honnie  
 Et si tolu m'onor,  
 Bien tost m'avries guerpie (P, ii, 17, 27).  
 Si j'avois su ça tantôt, je  
 N'aurois pas manqué de les laver (HH, Dom Juan, ii, 2).  
 Et si je n'avois eu que ma vie à défendre,  
 J'aurois su renfermer un souvenir si tendre (II, 1. 1209).  
 S'ils avaient été blessés, il aurait  
 Assurément entendu quelque bruit (MM, p. 123, 1. 30).

## II.

### RÉSUMÉ.

The following table gives a résumé of the occurrences noted above. The capital letters represent the authors, and the numerals placed to the right represent the number of times a given construction occurs in the author mentioned. If no numeral is expressed, the construction occurs only once in the text indicated. 'Rule' means that the construction given is found to the exclusion of competing constructions in the text indicated.

#### A. *Present condition contrary to fact.*

a. Imperfect subjunctive in the protasis and apodosis :

A, C<sup>2</sup> 6, F, G, J<sup>3</sup> 16, K<sup>4</sup>, M<sup>5</sup> 4, N<sup>6</sup> 4, O<sup>7</sup> 3,

<sup>2</sup> Cf. 899, 1102, 1717, 1760, 1769, 3764.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. 86, 144, 1488, 1525, 1626, 2393, 3238, 3913, 4041, 5234, 5389, 5727, 5894, 6426, 6742, 6768.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Anhang ii, v, 8.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. 461, 1142.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. 1326.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. 3796.

P<sup>8</sup> 6, Q 2, S<sup>9</sup> 5, T<sup>10</sup>, V 2, W<sup>11</sup> 2, Z<sup>12</sup>, AA<sup>13</sup> rule, BB<sup>14</sup> 3, CC<sup>15</sup> 3.

b. Imperfect subjunctive in the protasis and conditional in the apodosis:

B, K 5, P<sup>16</sup>, Q, R<sup>17</sup>, U<sup>18</sup>, V<sup>19</sup>, BB<sup>20</sup> 4, CC<sup>21</sup>.

c. Imperfect indicative in the protasis and conditional in the apodosis:

E<sup>22</sup> 2, J<sup>23</sup> 24, K<sup>24</sup> 12, L<sup>25</sup> rule, M<sup>26</sup> 7, N<sup>27</sup> 4, O<sup>28</sup> 2, P<sup>29</sup> 28, S 4, T<sup>30</sup> 10, U<sup>31</sup> 11, V 3, W 8, Z<sup>32</sup> 6, BB 3, CC 12, DD rule, EE 14, FF rule, GG rule, HH rule II rule, JJ rule, KK rule, LL rule, MM rule, NN rule.

### B. Past condition contrary to fact.

a. Imperfect subjunctive (=pluperfect) in the protasis and apodosis:

A 33 rule, C 34 2, F, J<sup>35</sup> 14, K<sup>36</sup>, M<sup>37</sup>, N rule, P<sup>38</sup> 2, Q rule, R, S 39 2, U<sup>40</sup>, V.

b. Imperfect subjunctive (=pluperfect) in the protasis and the pluperfect subjunctive in the apodosis:

C<sup>41</sup> 2, D<sup>42</sup>, J<sup>43</sup> 7, M 44 2, N<sup>45</sup>, P<sup>46</sup> 2, Q<sup>47</sup> 2, S<sup>48</sup> 2, U<sup>49</sup> 2, EE<sup>50</sup> 2.

c. Pluperfect subjunctive in the protasis

8 Cf. i, 52, 60; ii, 3, 34; ii, 9, 13; ii, 44, 50; ii, 61, 35; ii, 65, 11.

9 Cf. 1214, 1661, 2512. 10 Cf. 1321.

11 Cf. 682, 1009. 12 Cf. 49.

13 Cf. G. T. 16, G. T. 18, G. T. 26, G. T. 114, xiii, 2.

14 Cf. ci, 15; cii, 2; cxxxi, 3. 15 p. 66.

16 Cf. iii, 17, 21. 17 Cf. p. 5. 18 Cf. 1622.

19 Cf. 564. 20 Cf. xciv, 5. 21 Cf. p. 115.

22 Cf. 316, 320.

23 Cf. 625, 1001, 1501, 1503, 1781, 1992, 2273, 2276, 2528, 2582, 4080, 4622, 4778, 5163, 5171, 5545, 5557, 5954, 5975, 6008, 6256, 6294, 6579, 6792.

24 Cf. xi, 23; xvi, 14; xxiv, 23; xxv, 12; xxxviii, 9; xcvi, 33.

25 Cf. 2, 38; 6, 42; 12, 9; 14, 30; 22, 21; 24, 31; 25, 13; 40,

14; 40, 20.

26 Cf. 98, 424, 1428. 27 Cf. 118, 1646.

28 Cf. 3219, 4111 (compound of conditional used).

29 Cf. ii, 46, 34; ii, 47, 17; ii, 66, 46.

30 Cf. 1521, 3275. 31 Cf. 327, 1230.

32 Cf. 49, 55, 94. 33 Cf. 84e, 90ce 98ad, 98e.

34 Cf. 3439, 3441.

35 Cf. 267, 435, 2111, 3021, 3207, 3317, 3331, 4021, 4245, 5377, 5865, 6055.

36 Cf. lxx, 68. 37 Cf. 2021.

38 Cf. i, 57, 22; iii, 51, 47. 39 Cf. 1681, 1872.

40 Cf. 1446. 41 Cf. 691, 1728. 42 Cf. 123, 1.

43 Cf. 941, 1770, 2898, 3008, 3643, 3933, 6279.

44 Cf. 447, 1605. 45 Cf. 2044.

46 Cf. i, 21, 26; i, 39, 66. 47 Cf. 2818, 5379.

48 Cf. 1737, 2879. 49 Cf. 391, 802.

50 Cf. pp. 235, 382.

and imperfect subjunctive (=pluperfect) in the apodosis:

B<sup>51</sup>, G<sup>52</sup>, J 53 7, K<sup>54</sup>, N<sup>55</sup>, P<sup>56</sup>, U<sup>57</sup>, V<sup>58</sup>, W, LL<sup>59</sup>.

d. Pluperfect subjunctive in the protasis and apodosis:

J<sup>60</sup> 2, K<sup>61</sup> 3, M<sup>62</sup>, O<sup>63</sup>, S<sup>64</sup> 3, W<sup>65</sup> 4, Y<sup>66</sup> 2, AA<sup>67</sup> rule, CC 3, DD rule, EE<sup>68</sup> 11, FF rule, GG<sup>69</sup> 2, JJ 5, KK<sup>70</sup>, LL 7, MM<sup>71</sup> 2, NN<sup>72</sup>.

e. Pluperfect subjunctive in the protasis and conditional in the apodosis:

D<sup>73</sup>, G<sup>74</sup>, K 75 5, R<sup>76</sup>, CC<sup>77</sup>, EE<sup>78</sup>, GG<sup>79</sup>, II<sup>80</sup> 2, JJ 4, KK<sup>81</sup> 3, LL 5, MM 4, NN<sup>82</sup> 5.

f. Pluperfect indicative in the protasis and conditional perfect in the apodosis:

P 5, Q<sup>83</sup>, CC<sup>84</sup>, EE<sup>85</sup>, JJ 3, LL<sup>86</sup>, NN.

g. Pluperfect indicative in the protasis and conditional perfect in the apodosis:

K<sup>87</sup>, O<sup>88</sup>, P<sup>89</sup>, HH<sup>90</sup> rule, II<sup>91</sup>, JJ 2, KK<sup>92</sup> 3, LL 6, MM, NN.

h. Pluperfect indicative in the protasis and pluperfect subjunctive in the apodosis:

LL<sup>93</sup>, MM<sup>94</sup>.

51 Cf. 689. 52 Cf. i, 13, 34.

53 Cf. 1235, 1365, 2931, 3703, 5780, 6342.

54 Cf. iii, 36. 55 Cf. 2843.

56 Cf. iii, 52, 63. 57 Cf. 479.

58 Cf. 277. 59 Cf. p. 8, l. 17.

60 Cf. 5089, 6111.

61 Cf. viii, 28; lxxii, 115; lxxxix, 19.

62 Cf. 110. 63 Cf. 1191.

64 Cf. 1618, 3020, 4163. 65 Cf. 213, 1939, 3506.

66 Cf. p. 57.

67 Cf. G. T. 21, G. T. 55, G. T. 73.

68 Cf. pp. 7, 12, 181. 69 Cf. pp. 110, 257.

70 Cf. p. 210, l. 5. 71 Cf. p. 8, l. 18; p. 39, 19.

72 Cf. L'Aventurière ii, 4, 47.

73 Cf. 105, 22 (where the imperfect subjunctive equals the pluperfect).

74 Cf. ii, 2, 33.

75 Cf. xxx, 29 (see note 73); lxi, 31; lxii, 13; lxx, 40; lxx, 63.

76 Cf. p. 5. 77 Cf. p. 33.

78 Cf. p. 173. 79 Cf. p. 78.

80 Cf. Athalie, l. 724.

81 Cf. p. 98, l. 19; p. 110, l. 26; p. 112, l. 32.

82 Cf. L'Aventurière, ii, 8, 34.

83 Cf. 1191. 84 Cf. p. 101.

85 Cf. p. 508. 86 Cf. p. 203, l. 25.

87 Cf. xx, 21. 88 Cf. 2323.

89 Cf. ii, 17, 30.

90 Cf. Dom Juan, ii, 2, 58; ii, 3, 36; iv, 5, 17.

91 Cf. Iphigénie, l. 1209.

92 Cf. p. 123, l. 5; p. 165, l. 15; p. 166, l. 27.

93 Cf. La Petite Fadette, p. 165, l. 30.

94 Cf. p. 165, l. 27.

## III.

## DISCUSSION.

A. *Origin of the subjunctive in the Old French unreal condition.*<sup>95</sup>

The use of the subjunctive in the protasis and apodosis of the present and past condition contrary to fact in the earliest French texts is a survival of the Latin, where the imperfect<sup>96</sup> subjunctive was used when the condition referred to present time<sup>97</sup> and the pluperfect<sup>98</sup> subjunctive when the condition related to the past.

The conditional<sup>99</sup> began to supplant the subjunctive in the apodosis of the present condition contrary to fact about the middle of the eleventh century.<sup>100</sup> The substitution of the imperfect indicative in the protasis appears first in Philippe de Thaon,<sup>101</sup> who wrote at the beginning of the twelfth century.<sup>102</sup> However, the subjunctive did not disappear entirely in such constructions until the seventeenth century,<sup>103</sup> and even persisted later, in cases where one clause was suppressed.<sup>104</sup>

In the unreal condition referring to the past, the imperfect subjunctive was used for the pluperfect until the latter part of the thirteenth,

<sup>95</sup> Cf. C. I. 1102: *Fust i li Reis, n'i oïssum damage.*

<sup>96</sup> Cf. *Si haberem, darem.*

<sup>97</sup> The use of the past tenses in present unreal conditions is a problem of syntax that has never been satisfactorily explained. However, as the French borrowed the construction from the Latin, its solution must be sought in the Latin and not in the French. Suffice it to say that the French goes a step further than the Latin and uses the pluperfect in conditions relating to the present (*Fust i li Reis, n'i oïssum damage*). This is due to the fact that the Latin pluperfect has become the French imperfect subjunctive. For suggestions in regard to the reason for the use of the past for the present in this construction compare *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, xiv, 23-24.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. *Si habuissen, dedissem.*

<sup>99</sup> Cf. *Résumé*, p. 130.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. B. I. 326: Dist Guillelmes d'Oreng: "E Sainz Pieres, aïue!

Car la tennis en France, et Bertrans si i fusset,  
A pis et a martels sereit aconseïe!"

<sup>101</sup> Cf. E. I. 316:

E tuz tens durereit,  
Se li soleilz n'esteït.

<sup>102</sup> In regard to the date of the substitution of the indicative for the subjunctive here, compare A. Haase, *Syntaxe Française du XVII. Siècle*, Paris, 1898, § 66A, 114.

<sup>103</sup> Cf. *Se ne craignisse aultre que Dieu, je vous ostasse le quaquet (Moralité de Charité, Ancien Théâtre Français, III, 348).*

<sup>104</sup> Cf. Haase, *op. cit.*, § 66A.

or the beginning of the fourteenth century.<sup>105</sup> Haase is wrong, however, in intimating that this was the only way in which the pluperfect idea was expressed during this time.<sup>106</sup> As early as the eleventh century the pluperfect appears in *one* clause, sometimes in the protasis,<sup>107</sup> and sometimes in the apodosis,<sup>108</sup> the imperfect subjunctive still being kept in the other clause, but used in the sense of the pluperfect. The pluperfect in both clauses dates from the second half of the twelfth century, the first example in the texts examined occurring in Marie de France.<sup>109</sup>

In the past condition contrary to fact just as in the case of the unreal condition referring to the present, the first step in the disappearance of the subjunctive was the substitution of the conditional in the apodosis. The simple conditional occurred first in the conclusion of the unreal condition referring to the past in the first half of the twelfth century,<sup>110</sup> while the pluperfect indicative is found first in the protasis in the second half of the twelfth century.<sup>111</sup> The pluperfect indicative in the protasis with the conditional perfect in the apodosis appears first in the thirteenth century.<sup>112</sup>

In modern French the past condition contrary to fact is expressed in four different ways<sup>113</sup>: (1) pluperfect indicative in the protasis and conditional perfect in the apodosis<sup>114</sup>; (2) pluperfect subjunctive in the protasis and

<sup>105</sup> Cf. *Résumé*, p. 131.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. Haase, *op. cit.*, § 66B: "L'ancienne langue, dans la phrase *hypothétique irrèlle* se rapportant au *passé*, employait dans les deux propositions *l'imparfait du subjonctif* qui, dans son acception primitive, équivalait au *plus-que-parfait* du subjonctif moderne. Cet emploi subsista jusqu'au xiv. siècle, où il commença à faire place à un autre, celui du *plus-que-parfait* du subjonctif.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. G. 13, 14:

E si tu ne l'ousse fait,  
Deu apareillast tun règne sur  
Israel parmanablement.

<sup>108</sup> Cf. A. 98e: Se me leust si t'ousse guardet.

<sup>109</sup> Cf. xvii, 27:

N'eussent pas cel mal eü,  
S'il eüssent conseil creü.

<sup>110</sup> Cf. G. II, 2, 33: Si mort l'eüsse, à mort me turnereit.

<sup>111</sup> Cf. J. I. 3538:

S'ele s'en iert alee fors,  
Ne seroit pas au tel martire.

<sup>112</sup> Cf. p. 21. Compare also Haase, *op. cit.*, § 66B.

<sup>113</sup> For the relative frequency of these four constructions in the texts examined compare *Résumé*, p. 131.

<sup>114</sup> Cf. Si j' avais eu, j' aurais donné.

conditional perfect in the apodosis<sup>115</sup>; (3) pluperfect indicative in the protasis and pluperfect subjunctive in the apodosis<sup>116</sup>; pluperfect subjunctive in both clauses<sup>117</sup>.

C. *Why the subjunctive of the Old French unreal condition was later supplanted by the indicative.*

1. Present condition contrary to fact.

It will be observed that the Romance Languages of to-day express this condition in different ways. The French<sup>118</sup> uses the imperfect indicative in the protasis and the conditional in the apodosis, while the Spanish<sup>119</sup> and Italian<sup>120</sup> use the subjunctive in the protasis, and conditional in the apodosis. The French has discarded the Latin subjunctive in both clauses, while the Spanish and Italian have kept it only in the protasis. The first step in the disappearance of the subjunctive in such constructions in French was the substitution of the conditional in the conclusion. Already in B<sup>121</sup> the conditional has begun to supplant the subjunctive in the apodosis. It is even probable that there have been sporadic examples of the conditional in the conclusion of hypothetical sentences referring to the future<sup>122</sup> since about the beginning of the Popular Latin period.<sup>123</sup>

a. Why the conditional was substituted for the subjunctive in the apodosis.

aa. Foth<sup>124</sup> and Willers<sup>125</sup> attribute the introduction of the conditional in the second member of hypothetical sentences to the idea of *duty* and *necessity* expressed by it.<sup>126</sup> They claim that the two members of such conditional sentences are naturally joined together by this

<sup>115</sup> Cf. Si j' eusse eu, j' aurais donné.

<sup>116</sup> Cf. Si j' avais eu, j' eusse donné.

<sup>117</sup> Cf. Si j' eusse eu, j' eusse donné.

<sup>118</sup> Cf. NN, iv, 7, 47: Car s'ils en avaient plus, ils en feraient usage.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. Si tuviera, or tuviese, dinero compraría libros.

<sup>120</sup> Cf. Se l'avessi te lo darei.

<sup>121</sup> Cf. Résumé, p. 130.

<sup>122</sup> Cf. *Migne*, vol. 39, 2214, 6: *Sanare te habebat deus, si confitereris.*

<sup>123</sup> Cf. Thielmann, *Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik*, ii, 187.

<sup>124</sup> Cf. Willers, *Essai sur la formation et l'emploi syntaxique du conditionnel français*, Emmerick, 1886, p. 17.

<sup>125</sup> Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 17.

<sup>126</sup> Cf. Brunot, *Grammaire Historique de la Langue Française*, Paris, 1889, §452.

idea of *necessity* and *obligation*, and, hence, the substitution of the conditional, which has conveyed this meaning from the beginning, was a natural result. In regard to this explanation, Gessner says: <sup>127</sup>

“Aber wie erklärt sich dann das spanische und portugiesische Plusquamperfekt, dem doch ein solcher Begriff der Modalität nicht beiwohnt? Denn die von Foth (*Romanische Studien*, Heft 8, p. 277) gegebene Deduktion ist doch zu gewunden als dass man sich ihr anschliessen könnte. Dann scheint es mir aber auch sehr unwahrscheinlich, dass das Imp. Fut., man auch infolge seiner Entstehung eine ursprüngliche Bedeutung der Notwendigkeit darin anzunehmen hat, diese so lange gewahrt haben sollte, zumal das analog gebildete Futurum den rein temporalen Sinn von den ältesten Zeiten an so unzweideutig erkennen lässt.”

bb. Burgatzcky<sup>128</sup> starts from the imperfect of the future in real conditions depending upon the preterit of a verb of saying,<sup>129</sup> and supposes that it passed from this construction into the apodosis of unreal conditions referring to the present. As an objection to this explanation of the substitution of the conditional for the imperfect subjunctive in the conclusion of the present condition contrary to fact, Gessner<sup>130</sup> asks why the imperfect indicative is not also used in the *protasis* of unreal conditions relating to the present, just as it is in the protasis of the real condition depending on a verb of saying. Why should this real condition affect the apodosis of the unreal condition and not the protasis, as is shown by the fact that the Spanish and Italian keep the the subjunctive in the protasis.

cc. In regard to the use of the conditional in unreal conditions Gessner remarks<sup>131</sup>:

“Wenn nämlich die Folge auch naturgemäss an eine der Vergangenheit Ueberwiesene Bedingung anknüpft, so hat sie doch einen klaren Bezug auf die Gegenwart des Sprechenden, und um diesen idealen Zusammenhang mit dem Jetzt anzudeuten, gab es schwerlich eine geeignetere Zeit als diejenige, welche von der Vergangenheit in die Zukunft verweist; denn

<sup>127</sup> Cf. *Zeitschrift*, xiv, note 1 to p. 28.

<sup>128</sup> Cf. *Das Imperf. und Plusquamf. des Futurs im Altfranzösischen*, Greifswald, 1885, p. 14.

<sup>129</sup> Cf. Li Venicien distrent que se il i aloent, li coranz de l'aigue les enmenroit contreval le Braz (*Zeitschrift*, 14, note 1 to p. 30).

<sup>130</sup> Cf. *Zeit.*, note 1 to p. 30.

<sup>131</sup> Cf. *Zeitschrift*, xiv, p. 30.

in dieser Richtung liegt die Gegenwart; diese ist von der Vergangenheit aus angesehen ein Zukünftiges."

dd. On this point Thielmann<sup>132</sup> says:

"Der Leser wird schon längst gemerkt haben, dass es sich jetzt zur Erklärung des (eigentlichen) roman. Kondicionalis nur noch um eine Substitution handelt, um die Auswechslung einer alten Münze gegen eine neue. War einmal *habere* mit Inf. in der Umschreibung des Futurs soweit vorgeschritten, dass es sein Gebiet auch auf aktive Verba ausgedehnt hatte, so konnte für *facturus eram* das neue *facere habebam* eintreten, nicht nur in der Bedeutung 'ich war willens zu thun,' sondern auch im Sinne von 'ich hatte gethan' im Nachsatz eines irrealen Konditionalsatzes. Wahrscheinlich hängt diese Substitution auch mit dem Untergange des part. fut. act. zusammen. Der reiche Segen, wie er in den drei gleichbedeutenden Ausdrücken *facturus eram*, *fui fueram* vorlag, wurde später in der Weise verteilt, dass *facturus fueram* (= *facere habueram*) als Irrealis der Vergangenheit beibehalten, *facturus eram* aber und *f. fui* (= *facere habebam, habui*) auf die Gegenwart bezogen wurden. Letzteres konnte um so leichter geschehen, als ja bei den Begriffen des Mössens und Sollens, zu denen doch *habere* mit Inf. gehörte, der Ind. Imperf. zur Bezeichnung der Gegenwart im Nachsatz irrealer Konditionalsätze schon in klassischer Zeit üblich war: Cic. leg. Manil. § 50 *quodsi Romæ Cn. Pompeius privatus esset hoc tempore, tamen ad tantum bellum is erat deligendus* (= *deligi habebat*), id. Phil. 2, § 99 *quem patris loco, si ulla in te pietas esset, colere debebas* (das Nähere s. bei Foth, S. 263 ff.)."

The strongest argument against the theory that *facere habebam* was substituted for *facturus eram* in the apodosis of the unreal condition is the fact that the subjunctive<sup>133</sup> and not the conditional was used in such constructions in the earliest French texts. If such a substitution was made, why was it not made at the time when the French conditional (formed from the infinitive+*habebam*) first began to be used? According to Foth the conditional (<infinitive+*habebam*) was already frequent

<sup>132</sup> Cf. *Op. cit.*, ii, 190.

<sup>133</sup> Cf. Joseph Klapperich, *Historische Entwicklung der Syntaktischen Verhältnisse der Bedingungssätze im Altfranzösischen*. (In) *Französische Studien*, vol. iii<sup>4</sup>, 17; Gustav Busse, *Der Conjunctiv im Altfranzösischen Volksepos*, Kiel, 1880, p. 70; Richard Kowalski, *Der Conjunctiv bei Wace*, Breslau, 1882, p. 46; Karl Quiehl, *Der Gebrauch des Conjunctivs in den ältesten französischen Sprachdenkmälern*, Kiel, 1881, p. 38; Hermann Reichel, *Syntaktische Studien zu Villon*, Leipzig-Reudnitz, 1891, p. 43.

in ecclesiastical Latin in the third century.<sup>134</sup> Now, if the *facere habebam* construction grew out of *facturus eram*, etc., one would naturally expect to find examples of *facere habebam* in the conclusion of the condition contrary to fact from the origin of the Romance conditional.

While all of these suggestions are ingenious, they do not seem to solve in a satisfactory manner the problem under consideration. The conditional probably contained no idea of the present when it was first used in hypothetical sentences, but expressed a purely future conception in the form of the past. The fact that the conditional is the imperfect of the future does not exclude the idea of futurity. The simple future looks at the future from the present, while the conditional views it from the past. The use of the conditional in hypothetical sentences doubtless began in conditional sentences referring to the future, after the time when future conditions were expressed by the use of the past tenses.<sup>135</sup> Supporting this argument is a very old Latin example of the conditional used in a hypothetical sentence relating to the future.<sup>136</sup> Then from the conditional sentence referring to the future,<sup>137</sup> the conditional passed into present and past conditions.

b. Why the imperfect indicative was substituted for the imperfect subjunctive in the protasis.

aa. Gessner<sup>138</sup> says that the presence of the conditional in the apodosis of unreal conditions caused the use of the indicative in the protasis. He says that the language felt a need of expressing both members of the conditional sentence by the use of the same mood,<sup>139</sup> and thinks that the unreal condition like *si j'avais, je donnerais* may have been fashioned on the real condition *si j'ai, je donnerai*.

While this suggestion of Gessner is ingenious,

<sup>134</sup> Cf. Bernhard Willers, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

<sup>135</sup> Cf. *S'il venait demain, je le lui donnerais*.

<sup>136</sup> Cf. *Sanare te habebat deus, si confitereris* (Cf. Thielmann, *op. cit.*, 187).

<sup>137</sup> Cf. C, 1805:

Se ve ssum Rollant, ainz qu'il fust morz,  
Ensembl' od lui i durriums granz colps.

<sup>138</sup> Cf. *Zeits. hrift*, xiv, 32.

<sup>139</sup> Cf. L. Tobler in *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie*, ii, 49.

it is open to criticism. If the indicative in the apodosis brought about the use of the indicative in the protasis of the French unreal condition, why is not the same law observed in Spanish<sup>140</sup> and Italian?<sup>141</sup> Why does not the conditional in the apodosis drive out the subjunctive in the protasis of Italian and Spanish conditional sentences as well as in the French?<sup>142</sup>

The substitution of the imperfect indicative for the imperfect subjunctive in the protasis of the French present condition contrary to fact must be sought in the history of the language.

In the first place, a careful study of the history of French syntax reveals a constant tendency to restrict the sphere of the subjunctive.<sup>143</sup> Many verbs which were followed by the subjunctive in Old French are now followed by the indicative. An example of this is furnished by verbs of *thinking* and *believing*. The old form *cuidier* and the verbs *penser* and *croire* took the subjunctive in the old language, but take the indicative now. Especially noticeable is the gain of the indicative over the subjunctive in the imperfect tense. Not only has the imperfect subjunctive disappeared in hypothetical sentences assuming the supposed case as possible and in the unreal condition, but its disappearance in dependent clauses has been so marked in the popular speech that one scarcely hears to-day an imperfect subjunctive in the spoken French of Paris.

A suggestion that might explain in a general way the disappearance of the imperfect subjunctive in all of the cases indicated above is, to say that it was in keeping with the general tendency toward euphony. The majority of French verbs being of the first conjugation, the harsh ending in *-asse* predominated in the imperfect, and hence, there arose a tendency to discard this form and substitute others more euphonic. This change from the imperfect subjunctive to the imperfect indicative doubtless began in popular speech, just as the disappear-

ance of the imperfect subjunctive in dependent clauses to-day belongs to the language of conversation. It is to be remembered that at the beginning of the twelfth century, the time at which we have noted the first examples of the indicative for the subjunctive in the conditional constructions in question, there were comparatively few literary monuments in French and the majority of these were sung by Troubadour poets from court to court. Hence, there was no literary standard as there is to-day, the spoken language still predominating.

Favoring the supposition that the substitution of the imperfect indicative in the unreal condition is due in part to the general tendency toward euphony is the fact that in the unreal condition relating to the past the subjunctive is still possible. Here the auxiliaries *avoir* and *être* indicate the subjunctive and hence the harsh ending in *-asse* is avoided. For instance, one can say *si je l'eusse eu, je l'eusse donné* without violating the law of euphony.

While this general tendency towards euphony rendered easy the disappearance of the imperfect subjunctive in any construction, there is a still more specific reason for its loss in the unreal condition referring to the present. In the first place, it is to be observed that, while in Latin *si* was followed by the present<sup>144</sup> and perfect<sup>145</sup> subjunctive in a condition assuming the supposed case as possible, by the imperfect<sup>146</sup> and pluperfect<sup>147</sup> subjunctive in the present and past condition contrary to fact, in the earliest French texts these were all expressed by *si* with the imperfect subjunctive,<sup>148</sup> the imperfect having been used for the pluperfect until the latter part of the thirteenth or the beginning of the fourteenth century. In other cases *si* was usually followed by the indicative. There were many constructions where the simple tenses of the indicative

<sup>144</sup> Cf. *Dies deficiat, si velim causam defendere.*

<sup>145</sup> Cf. *Improbe feceris, nisi monueris.*

<sup>146</sup> Cf. *Si haberem, darem.*

<sup>147</sup> Cf. *Si habuissem, dedissem.*

<sup>148</sup> Cf. *Hi: E si aucuns meist main en celui ki la mere iglise requereit, si ceo fust u evesquē u abeie u iglise de religion, rendist ceo qu'il avreit pris.*

C, l. 1102, *Fust i li reis, ni oūssum damage;*  
J, l. 265, *Petit por mon oste f'isse,*  
Se cest don li escondïsse.

<sup>140</sup> Cf. *Si tuviessè daria.*      <sup>141</sup> Cf. *Se l'avessi te lo darei.*

<sup>142</sup> The Provençal and Catalan also show the indicative in the protasis of unreal conditions.

<sup>143</sup> Cf. L. Cl. dat, *Grammaire Élémentaire de la Vieille Langue Française*, Paris, 1885, § 462: "L'ancienne langue employait le subjonctif dans beaucoup de cas où nous mettrions aujourd'hui l'indicatif."



followed *si*<sup>149</sup> in Old French, and these may have controlled the one important construction where *si* was followed by the subjunctive.

Proving that it was through such a process of leveling that the indicative drove out the subjunctive in the protasis of the present condition contrary to fact is the survival of the imperfect subjunctive where *que* repeats *si*.<sup>150</sup> Here the Latin subjunctive remained because the analogy affected only those cases where the subjunctive was preceded by *si*. The Modern French use of the subjunctive in all constructions where *que* repeats *si*<sup>151</sup> is doubtless due to the unreal condition where the subjunctive is a survival of the Latin, as above indicated.<sup>152</sup>

A further proof of the supposition that the imperfect subjunctive was supplanted by the indicative in the protasis of the unreal condition relating to the present, because it is preceded by *si*, is the fact that where *si* is omitted the subjunctive is still used. For instance, one says *fût-il ici, j'irais*,<sup>153</sup> but the moment the *si* is used the indicative is required.<sup>154</sup> Under the influence of the present unreal condition the indicative passed into the protasis of the past unreal condition. The persistence of the subjunctive in the past condition contrary to

fact until the present time, may be due in part to Latin influence. Also poets used the subjunctive in rime when it would not have been used in prose.

#### IV.

##### BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- A. Vie de Saint Alexis. Ed. by Gaston Paris and Léopold Pannier. Paris, 1887.
- B. Karls des Grossen Reise. Ed. by Eduard Koschwitz. (In) Altfranzösische Bibliothek, Vol. ii. Heilbronn, 1883.
- C. Chanson de Roland. Ed. by Léon Gautier (Septième édition). Tours, 1880.
- D. Livres des Psaumes. Ancienne traduction française publiée pour la première fois d'après les manuscrits de Cambridge et de Paris par Francisque Michel. Paris, 1876.
- E. Philippe de Thaan: Comput. Ed. by Eduard Mall. Strassburg, 1873.
- F. Les Voyages Merveilleux de Saint Brandan à la Recherche du Paradis Terrestre. Pub. by Francisque Michel. Paris, 1878.
- G. Les Quatre Livres des Rois. Pub. by Le Roux de Lincy. Paris, 1841.
- H. Lois de Guillaume le Conquérant. Ed. by John E. Matzke. Paris, 1899.
- I. De Saint Laurent. Pub. by Werner Söderhjelm. Paris, 1888.
- J. Chrétien de Troies: Yvain. Ed. by W. Foerster. Halle, 1891.
- K. Marie de France: Die Fabeln der Marie de France. Ed. by Karl Warnke. (In) Bibliotheca Normannica, Vol. vi. Halle, 1898.
- L. Aucassin und Nicolette. Ed. by Hermann Suchier. Paderborn, 1889.
- M. Élie de Saint-Gilles. Pub. by Gaston Raynaud. Paris, 1879 (Société des anciens textes français).
- N. La Naissance du Chevalier au Cygne, ou les Enfants Changés en Cygnes. Ed. by Henry Alfred Todd. Baltimore, 1889.
- O. La Mort Aymeri de Narbonne. Pub. by J. Couraye du Parc. Paris, 1884 (Société des anciens textes français).

<sup>149</sup> Cf. C, l. 914: Se truis Rollant, de mort li doins fidance;  
C, l. 82: S'il vult ostages, il en avrat par veir;  
C, l. 273: Ne parlez mais, se jo nel vos comant;  
C, l. 788: Deus me confondet se la geste en desment;  
C, l. 721: Ja mais ne serai liède se vos me honireiz;  
*Psaunt. d'Oxf.*, 136, 6, Si je oblirai tei, a obliance  
seit dunée la meie destre;  
*Psaunt. d'Oxf.*, 138, 7, Si je munterai el ciel, tu  
iluec iés;

T, l. 154, Et se por lui souffroie paine,  
Bien le me prometoit a rendre;  
Joinville, 24, il me demanda se je vouloie estre  
honorez;

Y, p. 92, L'empereur donna aux seigneurs, Freres  
de Rhodes, celle isle, s'ilz la poyoient conquerer;  
II, Esther, l. 694, Si jamais à mes vœux vous fîtes  
favorable.

<sup>150</sup> Cf. EE, p. 404:  
Si j'avaï du papier  
De rames un millier,  
Et qu'il ne fust trop tard,  
Comme à mon amy seur,  
T'escrirois de bon cuer.

<sup>151</sup> Cf. S'il n' a que peu d'argent et qu'il veuille en avoir  
plus.

<sup>152</sup> Cf. *quand, comme, lorsque, puisque, pendant que*, etc.,  
which keep the indicative when repeated by *que*.

<sup>153</sup> Cf. L. Clédar, 2460.

<sup>154</sup> Cf. S'il etait ici, j'irais.

- P. Altfranzösische Romanzen und Pastourellen. Ed. by Karl Bartsch. Leipzig, 1870.
- Q. Gautier de Tournay: Gilles de Chin. Pub. by Le Baron de Reiffenberg. Bruxelles, 1847.
- R. Fragments d'une vie de Saint Thomas de Cantorbéry. Pub. by Paul Meyer. Paris, 1885 (Société des anciens textes français).
- S. Guillaume de Lorris: Roman de la Rose. Ed. by Francisque Michel, II. 1-4669. Paris, 1864.
- T. La Clef d'Amors. Ed. by A. Doutrepont. (In) Bibliotheca Normannica, Vol. v. Halle, 1890.
- U. Nicole de Margival: Le Dit de la Panthère d'Amours. Pub. by Henry Alfred Todd. Paris, 1883. (Société des anciens textes français).
- V. Robert de Blois: Floris et Liriope. Pub. by D. Wolfram v. Zingerle in the Altfranzösische Bibliothek, Vol. xii. Leipzig, 1891.
- W. Brun de la Montaigne. Pub. by Paul Meyer. Paris, 1875 (Société des anciens textes français).
- X. Cronique du Mont-Saint-Michel. Pub. by Simeon Luce. Vol. i. Paris, 1879 (Société des anciens textes français).
- Y. Seigneur d'Anglure: Le Saint Voyage de Jherusalem. Paris, 1878 (Société des anciens textes français).
- Z. Le Débat des Herauts d'Armes de France et d'Angleterre. Pub. by Léopold Pannier et Paul Meyer. Paris, 1875 (Société des anciens textes français).
- AA. François Villon: Oeuvres. Ed. by Auguste Longnon. Paris, 1892.
- BB. Rondeaux et Autres Poésies du xv. Siècle. Pub. by Gaston Raynaud. Paris, 1889 (Société des anciens textes français).
- CC. Chansons du xv. Siècle. Pub. by Gaston Paris. Paris, 1875. (Société des anciens textes français).
- DD. Martial d'Auvergne: L'Amant Rendu Cordellier à l'Observance d'Amours. Pub. by A. De Montaignon. Paris,

1881 (Société des anciens textes français).

- EE. Clement Marot: Oeuvres Complètes. Vol. i. Paris, 1824.
- FF. Montaigne: Essais. Ed. by Charles Louandre. Vol. i. Paris, 1876.
- GG. François Malherbe: Poésies. Published by MM. De Latour. Paris, 1842.
- HH. Molière: Oeuvres. (In) Les Grands Écrivains de la France. Vol. v. Paris, 1880.
- II. Racine: Oeuvres. Ed. by Paul Mesnard. Vol. iii. Paris, 1885.
- JJ. La Fontaine: Oeuvres. (In) Les Grands Écrivains de la France. Vols. i, ii, iii.
- KK. Balzac: Eugénie Grandet. Ed. by Eugène Bergeron. New York, 1895.
- LL. George Sand: (1) La Mare au Diable. Ed. by F. C. de Sumichrast. Boston, 1896; (2) La Petite Fadette. Ed. by Ferdinand Bôcher. New York, 1899.
- MM. Prosper Mérimée: Colomba. Ed. by J. A. Fontaine. Boston, 1897.
- NN. Émile Augier: Théâtre Complet. Vol. i. Paris, 1894.

OLIVER M. JOHNSTON.

Stanford University.

#### THE SONNET FORMS OF WYATT AND SURREY.

THE following study is an examination of the form of the sonnets of Wyatt and Surrey, with reference to the Italian standards used by Petrarch, whom they translated and imitated. By the largest definition, the Petrarchan sonnet consists of fourteen five-stressed iambic lines, grouped in two quatrains of two rimes each, and two tercets, forming a sestet, of two or three rimes. In all of Petrarch's sonnets the second quatrain repeats the rimes of the first; and in all but three the arrangement of the second is identical with that of the first; in three hundred and three out of three hundred and seventeen this is the enclosed rime (*abba*). The sestet of three rimes occurs in one hundred and eighty-seven sonnets, that of two in one hundred and thirty; of these only four are concluded with a couplet. In but one does the sestet contain a rime from the quatrains.

The most noticeable difference between